



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,217	07/28/2003	Thomas D. Erickson	YOR920030090US1	5463
877	7590	07/08/2009	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION, T.J. WATSON RESEARCH CENTER P.O. BOX 218 YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598				KIANERSI, MITRA
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2445				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/08/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

iplawyor@us.ibm.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/628,217	ERICKSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mitra Kianersi	2445	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/10/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1, 4-8, 12, 15-16, 19-23, 27, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Harold Emanuel, Fred Niederman, Stewart Shapiro Online services as distributed meeting support software; April 1995 **Publisher:** ACM, hereinafter Emanuel.

Claims 1 and 16: Emanuel teaches an article of manufacture in computer readable form comprising computer readable program code means stored for performing in a computer system a method for providing an online collaborative environment for at least one user at a user information processing device, said computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the method comprising the steps of, e.g., see page 214 under “distributed meeting activities”.:

Emanuel teaches a) creating an instance of an online meeting, the instance including graphically displayed separates meeting phases, e.g., see last row of Appendix 3, and an agenda, e.g., see

row 6-7, 9 of Appendix 3, of the meeting's phases and making the online meeting instance available to a plurality of users each at a user information processing device, e.g., see page 214 under "distributed meeting activities"; b) receiving input from at least one user, see row 6 of appendix 3.

c) depicting participating users in respective meeting phases of said instance and depicting user input in a graphical representation including a set of objects for showing updated meeting information, e.g., see page 217 left column at first paragraph, And see page 218 right column last paragraph. d) forwarding representation to all participating users said at least one user for display and user access at each the user information processing device, e.g., see page 214 under "distributed meeting activities".

Claims 12, 16 and 27 are rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 1, above.

Claims 4 and 19: The claimed limitations are taught by Emanuel on page 215 left column at first paragraph.

Claims 5 and 20: The claimed limitations are taught by Emanuel at bridging paragraph on page 216.

Claims 6 and 21: The article wherein said at least one user is assigned a role and the type of input and associated phase in which input can be given is restricted by the role, Emanuel teaches at e.g., see page 214 under "distributed meeting activities".

Claims 7 and 22: The claimed limitations are taught by Emanuel teaches on page 221 last row of appendix 3.

Claims 8 and 23: The claimed limitations are taught by Emanuel teaches on page 214, right column, last paragraph 5) provide access to transcripts, minutes and corporate data from prior meeting. The chat room feature gives participants the ability to brainstorm (brain Write) online. Participants can talk interactively in the private chat room and exchange ideas. An online service does not provide the ability to organize and prioritize typed data for further evaluation. Participants can use the service's file transfer capabilities to send files that may be needed for the meeting. This will help to ensure that participants have all

of the information they need for review prior to the meeting. Without use of an online service, participants would have to fax or mail written material and send disks containing material which had to be shared by participants.[216], 4th paragraph.

Claim 15: The claimed limitations are taught by Emanuel on page 214 last two lines of right col.

Claim 30 is rejected by Emanuel, see page 215 last paragraph left col.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-3, 9-11, 13-14, 17-18, 24-26,28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emanuel.

Claims 2 and 17:

Emanuel teaches the article wherein the method further comprises the steps of -automatically determining if all meeting phases have been completed; If all meeting phases have been completed, terminating the meeting instance; If all meeting phases have not been completed, repeating steps b) - d) until all phases specified in said agenda are completed. However, Emanuel does not teach automatically determining if all meeting phases have been completed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize when meeting facilitator

schedules the meeting which may include setting deadlines for participant responses; it means determine the meeting phases.

Claims 3 and 18 are rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 2, above.

Claims 9 and 24: The article according to claim 1, wherein said representation includes both graphic and text section and where the content of said text section is automatically adjusted to match user selection of the point of focus in the graphic section.

Participants are able to share files during a meeting. They would not be able to view the same file, simultaneously, online. All participants could, however, load a transferred file into software that resides on their individual PC. Using a Windows split screen or screen minimization feature, they could all view a copy of the same file. For example, any participant could send a Lotus or Excel spreadsheet to every other participant. Each participant could load the file on his or her PC. The group could then discuss the file over the telephone or, using split screen features, via the 216 chat session, The facilitator could have the responsibility of maintaining a “master” copy of any file being discussed. When discussion on a file is complete, the facilitator would transfer the changed file to all participants. Participants would then have a copy of the updated file. Discussion

Claims 10 and 25: The article according including showing in said graphic section said at least one user's visiting a previous or future phase. The claimed limitations are taught by Emanuel teaches on page 214, right column, last paragraph 5) provide access to transcripts, minutes and corporate data from prior meeting

Claims 11 and 26: The article according to claim 9, including means for setting status of objects in said graphic representation to one or more of: Open/Locked; New Information/Seen;

Glitter/No Glitter. (this step is a user defined function and has been created or programmed by the applicant)

Claim 13: The system wherein the server is a web-portal and said receiving and forwarding is performed using the HTTP protocol. Emanuel teaches on page 214 left column, it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to recognize that the HTTP protocol is one of the internet protocol.

Claim 14: The system further comprising an archiving component for creating an archive version of the completed meeting instance. Page 217, left column, first par provide core storage for data bases during the course of the meeting.

Claim 28 is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 2, above.

Claim 29 is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 3, above

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mitra Kianersi whose telephone number is (571)272-3915. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571)272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mitra Kianersi/
Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/VIVEK SRIVASTAVA/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2445